

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/933,666	08/22/2001	William R. Herrell III	11011-0002	6634
7	590 10/06/	2004	EXAMINER	
CLARK & B	RODY	NGUYEN, MERILYN P		
Suite 600 1750 K Street,	NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, I		•	2171	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	100		
ř	Advisory Action	09/933,666	HERRELL, WILLIAM	1 R.		
	Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Merilyn P Nguyen	2171			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addi	ress		
FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
		EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
b) [no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF Th	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP		
ee hav ee und 2) as s	tensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The e been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of er 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official of the control	of extension and the corresponding amon the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate of the final (opriate extension Office action; or		
1.	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF					
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
•) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b					
(C	they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the		
(d) 🔲 they present additional claims without cancell	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	3.		
	NOTE:					
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject					
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
5.⊠	The a) \boxtimes affidavit, b) \boxtimes exhibit, or c) \boxtimes request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consi e Continuation Sheet.	dered but does NOT	「place the		
6.□	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly		
7.	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an		
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
	Claim(s) allowed:					
	Claim(s) objected to:					
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-18</u> .					
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8.	The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.			
9.	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)				
10.	Other:	10	2			
		S	OFFT YOU INHIC XAMIN	IFR		
		SUPER' : TECh	R 2100			

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Indicate on record that the Declaration was filed as an Affidavit under 37 CFR 1.131. The evidence is not persuasive and the rejection of claims 1-18 under 103(a) over Shields (US 2002/0032636), in view of Gakidis (US 2002/0095305) is hereby retained. Upon analysis of exhibit, the examiner discovered that nowhere in the exhibit shows the exact or specific date of inventor planning process. Since the effective filing date of the Gakidis is August 21, 2000, and also before the effective filing date of instant invention. Therefore, Gakidis invention was also conceived prior his effective filing date. Without proving the date from exhibit, the Gakidis reference is still good as prior art. Please notes the error of Gakidis effective filling date on page 2, line 3.